



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

erty for public use without compensation, or the taking of liberty or property without due process at law are held in *Pardee v. Salt Lake County* (Utah), 36 L. R. A. (N. S.), 377, not to entitle a person designated by the court to defend an indigent prisoner, to recover compensation for his services from the public.

Gross carelessness in failing to keep books and accounts of clients, and in misrepresenting the facts to clients because of failure to know the truth with respect to them, as his duty requires, are held in *Re Robertson* (S. D.), 36 L. R. A. (N. S.), 442, not to be sufficient to require the disbarment of an attorney.

---

**Patent—Revocation for Non-Manufacture within United Kingdom—Threat of Action for Infringement—Excuse for Non-Manufacture—Patent Act, 1907 (7 Edw. VII. c. 29), ss. 24, 27—(R.S.C. c. 69, s. 38).**—*In re Taylor's Patent* (1912) 1 Ch. 635. In this case the appellants were the owners of an English patent of invention issued in 1904. The Eriths Engineering Company were owners of another patent of which the appellant's patent was declared by a United States court to be an infringement. The appellants had made efforts to exploit their patent in England, but had been deterred by threats of the Eriths Engineering Company to bring an action for infringement, from proceeding to manufacture their patented article in England. In 1910 the Eriths Engineering Company applied to the Controller-General to revoke the appellants' patent for non-manufacture in England under s. 27 of the Patent Act (7 Edw. VII. c. 29) (see R.S.C. c. 69, s. 38), and the application was granted, but Parker, J., on appeal held that the threat of action was a sufficient excuse, and he cancelled the revocation.—English Case in Canada Law Journal.

---

**Tradename—Company—Similarity of Name—Right of Individual to Trade in His Own Name—Transfer to Company of Use of Individual Name.**—*Kingston v. Kingston* (1912) 1 Ch. 575. This was an action tried without pleadings. The plaintiff company sought to restrain the defendant company from using the name of Kingston as part of its trade name. The plaintiff company (Kingston, Miller & Co.) was incorporated in 1897, to carry on the business of caterers formerly carried on by Kingston & Miller. The sole managing director of the company had a son named Thomas Kingston, who was associated as assistant in carrying on the business. In 1911 he left the employment of the plaintiff company and joined with a Mr. Wheatley and established a company which was incorporated as "Thomas Kingston & Co." for the purpose of carrying on a similar business to that of the plaintiff company, and of which new company Thomas Kingston was managing director. Warrington, J., who tried the action, although conceding that Thomas Kingston, in